DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 990 EA 014 995

AUTHOR Thomas, Henrietta K.
TITLE Community Schools for Chicago, An Idea Whose Time Has Come? A Special Report to the Chicago Community Schools Study Commission.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 52p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *Community Control; *Decentralization; Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; *Organizational Change; Public Schools; *School Community Relationship; School Effectiveness; *School Organization; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL

ABSTRACT

The difficulties faced by Chicago's public school system have prompted two state-level investigative bodies to recommend the breaking up of the system into smaller, locally controlled units. Without exhaustively reviewing all of the factors involved in making the transition from a centralized to a decentralized school governance structure, this report raises the questions that must be considered before such action is taken. The critical issues of effectiveness, responsiveness, and fiscal responsibility are addressed as they relate to school governance in general and to the Chicago school system in particular. The report consists of three sections: a mini-history of the Chicago school system, emphasizing past influences affecting present problems; an overview of the community control movement and its impact on urban education; and a discussion of the applicability of the community control concept to the Chicago schools. (Auhtor/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Henrietta K. Thomas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS FOR CHICAGO,

AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME?

A Special Report to the Chicago Community Schools Study Commission

EA 014 995

by Henrietta K. Thomas, M.A.

Copyright 1982, Henrietta K. Thomas

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

CHICAGO'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A MINI-HISTORY 3

Race and Education in Chicago 4
The Push for Integrated Schools 5
Ethnic Politics and Education in Chicago 7
Religion and Education in Chicago 9
The Search for New Alternatives 10

COMMUNITY CONTROL OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS: AN OVERVIEW 12

The Case Against Large School Systems 13
The Case for Community Control 14
Experiments in Community Control 15
Community Control - Was it Worth the Effort? 17
Decentralization and Community Control 19
Decentralization - Is it the Answer? 24

COMMUNITY CONTROL: WILL IT WORK IN CHICAGO? 25

The Search for Community 26
The Need for Control 27
Community Control - A Practical Solution? 29
The Political Implications of Community Control 30
Community Control - The Suburban Model 31
Addressing the Needs of Diverse Populations 33
The Equal Opportunity Mandate 35
Paying the Freight 36

CONCLUSION 39

BIBLIOGRAPHY 40

Shall there be an inferior class of schools which the more fortunate will not patronize because they can afford to pay high tuition, and which the less fortunate but proud spirited will not patronize because they are the schools of the common people? Or shall it be a class of schools so elevated as to be worthy of the patronage of the whole community?

—John Dore, Chicago's first Superintendent of Schools, in his 1855 Report.

INTRODUCTION

Something's wrong with Chicago's public school system. It isn't working any more. It's like an old car, low on gas, trying desperately to reach the top of the hill. The driver pumps the accelerator and urges the old girl on, but to no avail. She just doesn't have it any more. It's time to trade her in for a new model.

Chicago's public school system has been subjected to much doctoring over the past twenty years. Numerous experts have studied the problems and prescribed various treatments for a host of chronic illnesses. But the reforms have been short-lived and a permanent cure has yet to be found. Chicago's public schools are not much better off today than they were when Ben Willis left town sixteen years ago.

From time to time, state level investigative bodies have studied the Chicago public school system and made recommendations for improvement. Two of these - the Peterson Commission (1971) and the DeAngelis Committee (1980) - have urged the breaking up of the system into several smaller, locally controlled units of school governance. The Chicago Community Schools Study Commission was established by the Illinois General Assembly in 1981 to explore the possibilities of implementing these suggestions.

The rationale for considering such a radical restructuring of school governance in the City of Chicago is that many people believe the present system has become too large and unwieldy to effectively discharge its basic function of educating the city's children and that better results might be obtained if smaller systems were created.

Another factor in the decision to reconsider Chicago's school governance structure is the realization that, over the years, the present system has become increasingly isolated from the people it is supposed to serve and that the establishment of community school districts might bring the schools and the people closer together.

There has also been increasing concern over the cost of public education in the City of Chicago as compared to other school districts in the state and it is hoped that smaller districts will be more cost-effective and fiscally responsible.

This report will attempt to address the critical issues of effectiveness, responsiveness, and fiscal responsibility in the context of school governance in general and the Chicago public school system in particular. It includes (a) a mini-history of the Chicago public school system, emphasizing past influences on present problems, (b) an overview of the community control movement and its impact on urban education, and (c) a discussion of the applicability of the community control concept to the Chicago public schools. It is not intended to be an exhaustive review of all the factors involved in making the transition from a centralized to a decentralized school governance structure, but only to "touch the bases" and raise the questions which must be considered before such action is taken.

The restructuring of Chicago's public school system is an important undertaking vital to the city's future and must be accomplished in an orderly fashion by taking into account all the factors which might help or hinder effective implementation. It is hoped that this report will help to clarify some of those issues for both the commission and the citizens of the City of Chicago and that it will make a positive contribution to the debate.

Henrietta K. Thomas

September, 1962

CHICAGO'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A MINI-HISTORY

The first public school in Chicago was opened in 1832 in a stable donated by Richard Hamilton, Cook County's first Commissioner of School Lands, with a student body of twelve - four whites and eight Indians - and a faculty of one.

By 1840, the "system" had four teachers serving 317 children on an annual budget of $3,307.

A hundred years later, in 1940, total enrollment was 399,438, the faculty had grown to 13,902, and the budget was $71,443,560.

Today, the Chicago public school system is a billion dollar business with 40,000 employees serving half a million students in 600 schools.

The same troubles that beset the schools in 1832 - lack of funds, poorly trained teachers, ineffective curricula, political interference - beset the system today. Indeed, it seems as if some of the problems have never left us - and some of the same solutions are being tried over and over again without success.

What shall we do about the schools? is a question that has been raised by concerned citizens in the City of Chicago thousands of times in the past 150 years. And the answer has always been the same: a little bit, but not too much. Education has never been high on the priority lists of municipal governments in the City of Chicago.

From the early days of the independent township districts through the excesses of the Thompson and Kelly-Nash machines to the twenty-year reign of Richard J. Daley, the schools have often been "last helped, first hurt" in crises facing the city. There were times in the past when the schools were plundered for profit by ruthless politicians and businessmen over the protests of concerned educators and civic leaders. And calls for reform often went unheeded.[1]

---

[1]The 1898 Harper Report was the first in a long line of in-depth studies of the Chicago public school system which detailed its shortcomings and made recommendations for improvement.

But the protests and pleas for reform continued and, though the emphasis changed from time to time, the basic theme has always been:

...the schools need more money
...the schools need better teachers
...the schools need more effective administrators
...politicians should not meddle in school affairs
...and Johnny can't read

The "Johnnies" of yesteryear who couldn't read were the sons and daughters of poor immigrants who couldn't afford to send their children to private schools; the Johnnies of today are the sons and daughters of minority groups - mainly blacks and Hispanics - who feel their needs are being ignored by the establishment.

Race and Education in Chicago

Race as an issue in city - and school - affairs has increased in importance over the years as minority populations have grown and expanded in the inner-city. As a result, the early power struggles between Chicago's large Irish and German populations were gradually transformed into white/non-white confrontations. And the issue will not go away because we are all caught by our heritage in the web of racism.

Although Chicago's first school law (1835) limited public school attendance to white children only and state law (1855) specified that blacks who did not pay taxes had no claim on public education funds, many black children attended integrated public schools in early 19th century Chicago. And when the legislature tried to amend its Black Code in 1853 to halt the migration of free Negroes into the state, Chicago's representatives (all white) voted as a bloc against it.[2]

But by 1863, the mood of the city fathers had changed and the city council passed an ordinance (the Black School Law of 1863) requiring segregated schools. Blacks immediately organized themselves and mounted a vigorous attack on the law, which was repealed in 1865.[3]

[2]Mary J. Herrick, The Chicago Schools: A Social and Political History (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1971), p. 399-401.

[3]Herrick, p. 52-53. The Mission School, at Fourth and Taylor, was the city's first segregated school.

But this was not the end of school segregation in the City of Chicago. As the black population increased, various methods (restrictive covenants, discriminatory real estate practices, social pressures, etc.) were used to keep them out of white neighborhoods, thus effectively separating black children from white schools. And if that didn't work, school boundaries were gerrymandered to achieve the same result. The end of "de jure" segregation in Chicago signaled the beginning of "de facto" segregation.

The Push for Integrated Schools

The battle for equal educational opportunity has been fought on many fronts by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Urban League. Their efforts were rewarded in 1954 when the Supreme Court, in Brown vs. Board of Education, struck down the "separate but equal" doctrine and declared that compulsory segregation of the races in public schools constituted a denial of the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, and again a year later, when it called on public officials to desegregate their schools "with all deliberate speed."

Throughout the 50's and 60's, blacks fought hard for school integration. While their initial efforts were directed at the South, they eventually turned their attention to the North, charging that "de facto" segregation was just as evil as "de jure" segregation. Chicago's blacks were actively involved in the civil rights movement and engaged in numerous activities designed to desegregate Chicago's public schools. And though they met with resistance at almost every turn, they continued to press their case against the system.

In the early 1960's:

...the Chicago Urban League published its first studies detailing the failures of the Chicago public school system in meeting its obligations to provide equal opportunities to <u>all</u> Chicago's children;

...several court suits were filed by black parents to compel the Board of Education and Superintendent Benjamin C. Willis to initiate and implement effective desegregation programs;

...the Illinois General Assembly passed the Armstrong Act forbidding the gerrymandering of sub-districts to promote segregated schools;

...the U. S. Office of Education threatened to withhold federal funds from the Chicago Public Schools due to lack of progress on school desegregation;

...and the black community organized a number of public demonstrations and school boycotts in support of their demands for quality, integrated education.

During this same period, two special studies authorized by the board - the Hauser and Havighurst reports - supported many of these "outside" criticisms and made a number of suggestions for improvements in curriculum, staffing, auxiliary services, in-service training, and administration, some of which were implemented by subsequent superintendents.[4] But the most interesting proposals with far-reaching implications - such as Hauser's open enrollment plans and Havighurst's "expanded community" school districts - have yet to be seriously considered by either the board or its staff.[5]

Despite all this activity, however, blacks were unable to achieve their goals. From the time of the Hauser Report (1964) to a follow-up by Orfield (1979) fifteen years later, the segregation indexes for Chicago's public school children had not changed. Blacks, whites, and Latinos were still housed in predominantly single-race schools.[6]

It wasn't that Chicago didn't try. Since 1964, the board and its staff has developed and implemented a number of desegregation plans,

---

[4]James F. Redmond, 1966-76, and Joseph P. Hannon, 1976-80.

[5]Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools, Report to the Board of Education, City of Chicago (Chicago: Board of Education, 1964), p. 27-29; Robert J. Havighurst, The Public Schools of Chicago: A Survey for the Board of Education (Chicago: Board of Education, 1964), p. 385-390. Hauser advocated total open enrollment at the high school level, a modified open enrollment plan for middle schools, and a limited permissive transfer plan for elementary grade students. Havighurst urged the creation of three semi-independent sub-districts of approximately 400,000 population each in three racially mixed areas of the city.

[6]Gary Orfield, Voluntary Desegregation in Chicago: A Report to Joseph Cronin, State Superintendent of Education (unpublished paper, 1979), p. 4. Orfield reports that the segregation indexes for the ten-year 1968-78 period were 90-92% white from black, 64-65% white from Latino, and 88-89% black from Latino. Hauser (p. 14-15) had previously reported a 90% segregation rate for the city's elementary grade students.

They adjusted school boundaries, approved permissive transfer plans, and established "magnet" schools to help stem the tide of "white flight." These programs were helpful to some students, but not to the majority, and so did little to alleviate racial isolation or improve the quality of education for minority students. Many of the reasons for this lack of progress in Chicago, the city which once had championed blacks' demands for freedom from slavery,[7] are deeply rooted in its social and political history.

Ethnic Politics and Education in Chicago

Although Jean Baptiste DuSable, a black, was Chicago's first permanent settler, it was many years before blacks became a significant force in the city's social and political life. When Chicago received its first city charter in 1833, most blacks were still slaves, even in the State of Illinois, and freedmen had to present a "certificate of freedom" and post a $1,000 bond before they could enter the state. Free blacks could own property and pay taxes, but only white males had the right to vote.[8]

Chicago has always been a community of ethnics. The early settlers in Chicago - Germans, Czechs, Poles, Italians, Russians, Jews, and the Irish - were too concerned with their own survival in the new land to worry about other people's problems. From the beginning, they carried their old world customs with them, forming their own ethnic organizations, and competing with each other for power in the new city. The early politicians saw this as a tremendous opportunity to "divide and conquer," and they used the ethnics' group loyalties and mutual antagonisms to their own advantage.

Ethnic issues quickly became educational issues in the early days when self-segregation was the rule. In the five semi-autonomous school districts which existed prior to the 1857 reorganization, local citizens could pressure their local school trustees (who, until 1839, were elected officials with power to hire and fire teachers and levy taxes in the districts) into making changes in the schools which reflected the needs and desires of the local community. And the trustees, ever mindful of the votes cast by the local citizenry, often gave them what they wanted. Later, when the city council (and, eventually, the mayor) obtained increased control over school affairs, this same system prevailed. By

[7]Herrick, p. 401.

[8]Ibid., p. 399.

granting small wishes to the ethnic communities, the politicians expanded their sphere of influence and power, yet still retained the loyalties of the ethnic groups.

An early example of the power of the ethnic groups to affect the educational system in the City of Chicago occurred in the late 1860's when the Germans insisted that the German language be taught in the public schools. Over the objections of other ethnic groups, a pilot program was initiated and subsequently expanded to include 242 teachers and 34,547 students by 1892. Efforts by the state to end this practice and require English language instruction were defeated twice and the German classes continued until the outbreak of World War I, when it suddenly became unfashionable to be German.[9]

Another area in which the ethnic influence on educational affairs could be seen was in mayoral appointments to the school board. The early mayors, who often appointed personal friends and political cronies to the board, usually made an effort to ensure ethnic representation by reserving a "slot" for each ethnic group. As the city grew, business and labor interest groups began to develop, and slots were created for them, too. Soon, it came to be seen as a "right" for certain special interest groups to be represented on the school board, and persons leaving the board were usually replaced by another person with the same ethnic/interest group orientation. The first black was appointed in 1944; the first Hispanic in 1969. The "right" of these minority groups to have a voice in school affairs had finally been recognized.

The pattern changed only slightly after 1946, when scandals forced Mayor Kelly to accept a citywide Advisory Commission on School Board Nominations made up of representatives of prestigious mainline organizations who recruited potential board members from among the city's elites. Still, the three mayors - Kelly, Kennelley, and Daley - who used the commission continued the pluralist practice of ensuring dual ethnic/interest group representation. The result has been, for the most part, a factionalization of the board along ethnic/interest group lines with minimal public participation.[10]

---

[9]Herrick, p. 61.

[10]For an in-depth analysis of Mayor Daley's pluralist bargaining strategy, see Paul E. Peterson, School Politics, Chicago Style (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976).

Religion and Education in Chicago

The tie that binds most of the white ethnic groups together is religion. For, along with their old world customs, the immigrants also brought priests, rabbis, and ministers. The church provided them with a safe refuge from the hustle and bustle of life in the new city. If you were cold, or hungry, or homeless, you could always find help through the church. For the church was the center of the neighborhood's religious and social life. It was only natural, then, for some of the first schools in Chicago to be church connected.[11] Some were started by "do-gooders" who wanted to get the "urchins" off the street; others were started by ethnics who wanted to preserve their religious heritage.

Chicago's Roman Catholic school system, for example, had its beginnings as a protest movement in the mid-19th century when there was much prejudice against Roman Catholics in general and the Irish in particular. Seeing that they really weren't welcome in the Protestant-dominated public schools and feeling that the schools really didn't meet their needs anyway, the Catholics started their own parish schools. As the Catholic population grew, so did their school system, and it wasn't long before Chicago had two school systems - one public and one parochial.

The growth of the Catholic school system in Chicago (and other large cities as well) did two things - it provided an alternative for parents who were unhappy with the public schools and it eroded taxpayer support for public school funding. For many property owners who sent their children to Catholic schools began to resent tax increases for public education. And, in recent years, some have lobbied for tuition tax credits to offset what they consider to be a form of "double taxation."

In terms of numbers, Chicago's private and parochial schools are not a serious threat to the public schools. But they are believed to be "better" than the public schools in many respects and, given the money, many parents would prefer to send their children to private or parochial schools. This is a serious challenge to the public schools, for they must now compete on the open market to prove that they are worthy of continued public support.

---

[11] Eliza Chappel, teacher at the Presbyterian Church, was the city's first recipient of public education funds in 1834. See Herrick, p. 24.

The Search for New Alternatives

Chicago's public schools have been reorganized several times in the past 150 years, mostly to promote centralization of the system and to place power in the hands of fewer and fewer people.

Amidst the turmoil of the late 1960's, however, there were those who sought to reverse this trend by attempting to communicate more effectively with the average citizen. Chief among these were several school board members and former Superintendent James F. Redmond.

Responding to citizen unrest over the policies of the previous superintendent, Benjamin C. Willis, Redmond and the board sought to develop advisory councils at the sub-district and local school levels. These were eventually established, but not without considerable opposition from the administrative staff, which had the task of developing guidelines for the councils. The result was an extremely limited advisory role for the councils with absolutely no power to influence school policy.[12]

Administrative resistance to the advisory councils was most pronounced when, in 1971, the board established procedures whereby local community members might have a voice in the selection of principals for their schools. The Chicago Principals Association promptly filed suit against the board, challenging its authority to allow citizen input into the principal assignment process. The board was upheld by the courts, but its guidelines were struck down and had to be revised to conform with legal requirements. And finally, the board found it necessary to have the new procedures incorporated into state law. Even so, few principals have been appointed by this method; in the 1977-78 school year, only 14 new assignments were made under the community involvement guidelines[13] and, since then, numerous "interim" appointments have been made to circumvent the law.

Redmond also tried to increase system responsiveness by dividing the city into three administrative areas and appointing area superintendents (as recommended by management consultants Booz Allen & Hamilton), but this did not increase community participation in school affairs, and the areas were quietly abolished by Redmond's successor, Joseph P. Hannon.

---

[12] Peterson, p. 226.

[13] "How the Principal Selection Guidelines are Working," Citizens Schools Committee Report 1:12 (June 1978), p. 4, 8-9.

During the Hannon administration, community input was sought to help develop school desegregation plans. Members of the Citywide Advisory Committee on School Desegregation spent many hours over a period of several months developing a two-tiered desegregation plan which emphasized the use of voluntary measures before imposing a mandatory back-up plan. But when they submitted their report, they found that the board's central office staff had been working on their own plan, "Access to Excellence," which consisted primarily of a watered-down version of many of the CWAC proposals minus the back-up provisions. The CWAC report was duly accepted by the board and filed away, never to be heard of again.[14]

Since then, little effort has been made by the system to involve citizens in the decision-making process. Even though a predominantly minority board was appointed in 1980 in the wake of a serious financial scandal, this did little to improve communications. Most decisions were foregone conclusions with public hearings held only as a formality to be dispensed with as quickly as possible. And it wasn't long before the influence of City Hall began to reassert itself, thus making it even more difficult for change to occur.

But the reformers have not given up. Recently completed studies by Chicago United and the Citizens Schools Committee have made some rather pointed suggestions for improvements in the school system; proposals for an elected board have been revived in the city council; and several state legislators have called for a total restructuring of school governance in the City of Chicago.

The choice is clear: to retain the present centralized system with either an appointed or elected board and continue external pressures for change, or to dissolve the present system and replace it with several smaller, independent school districts with their own locally elected school boards.

The latter option - the subject of this report - is known in the literature as community control.

---

[14]It should also be noted that, during this same period, the Chicago Urban League's comprehensive citywide plan to use strategically located upper grade centers to promote integration was also ignored.

COMMUNITY CONTROL OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS: AN OVERVIEW

Community control of public schools has been a "given" of American life since 1647, when Massachusetts passed the "Old Deluder Satan Act" requiring all towns in the colony to establish and maintain public schools. As the nation grew and the pioneers moved westward to establish new towns, they usually set up some sort of school for their children. They hired their own teachers, bought textbooks, determined curricula, and raised funds to support the project. Subsequent state legislation providing for the establishment and maintenance of local school districts merely legitimized and provided a formal structure for what the people had already done.

There are, at the present time, about 15,000 school districts in the United States, the vast majority of which are locally controlled by locally elected school boards. There has been no need for a "community control" movement in rural and suburban America because centralization has not been a problem for them. But centralization has become a serious problem in the nation's urban areas and that is where the community control battles have been fought.

From the late 1800's through the late 1950's, the trend in urban education was toward ever-increasing centralization of power and authority, first toward city officials and then toward school professionals. As a result, many urban dwellers lost their right to elect school board members, vote on school tax increases, or influence school policy. For over time, these functions had been transferred (by law or default) to mayors, city councils, and school administrators, and the people were effectively "locked out" of the decision-making process.[15]

Until the late 1950's, most people seemed to be satisfied with this arrangement. But then they began to realize that, although the world around them had changed significantly in the preceding fifty years,

---

[15]Bill Burges, "Rx for School Governance," Journal of Education 159:1 (Feb 1977) 43-47. For a detailed history of the centralization process, see Joseph M. Cronin, The Control of Urban Schools (New York: The Free Press, 1973) and/or David B. Tyack, The One Best System (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974).

urban schools had, in many respects, stood still. Population changes, technological advances, governmental influences, Sputnik, the rise of the civil rights movement, and a general increase in "social problems" all had their impact on the schools, but the schoolmen failed to adjust the system to meet the needs of a changing society and continued to "keep school" as usual. External pressures for change in the early 60's were largely ineffective, and people began to see that the system itself was the problem.

The Case Against Large School Systems

The dysfunctionalities of large urban school systems has been well documented. The problem seems to be that, in highly centralized bureaucracies, an undue emphasis is placed on hierarchical authority, rules and regulations, and the use of various control mechanisms to insure uniformity within the organization. This may be fine for dealing with "things," which are predictable and manipulable, but it doesn't work too well with people.

The problem with students, teachers, and parents is that they are people - different people - with different socioeconomic backgrounds, different lifestyles, different ways of thinking, different ways of teaching, different ways of learning. This makes them unpredictable. And when unpredictable people make demands on a system which seeks stability through conformity, a clash in values is inevitable, because the system is not geared for change. It is limited in its ability to respond to external demands by the constraints of its internal environment, which rewards conformity and discourages creativity. The result is a gigantic mismatch between the goals of the organization and the goals of the people it is trying to serve.

The system's response to this "conflict of interests" is usually to intensify its own efforts on behalf of its own agenda through increased supervision of classroom teachers and the establishment of various forms of "competency-based" achievement testing in the name of "accountability," as if children and teachers could be "forced" to submit to the demands of the pre-ordained curriculum. But the system does not change. It closes in upon itself and "turns out" any attempt, internal or external, to influence its direction and becomes increasingly defensive in its relationships with the outside world. Those who do not agree with the system are excluded from the decision-making process, and "the system" plods along on its merry way, not knowing or not caring that it has lost touch with reality.

The Case for Community Control

The proponents of community control recognize that the main reason for this sorry state of affairs is that the centralized structure of urban school systems effectively removes control of the schools from the people whom the schools are supposed to serve and places it in the hands of professionals who often have little interest in, or understanding of, their needs. The result is a school system of, by, and for the professionals, and an ever-widening communications gap between those professionals and the people who depend on them for the education of their children. The only remedy, they say, is a return to local lay control of urban schools.[16]

Putting the shoe on the other foot, community control advocates charge that the failure of so many inner-city school children to succeed in the middle-class system is actually the failure of the system to address the children's needs. It is not the child, or his teacher, or his parents who must be changed, they declare - it is the system itself which must change. And there is only one direction in which to go - away from bureaucracy toward democracy.

If urban dwellers had the same relationship to their schools as their non-urban counterparts still enjoy, say the advocates of community control, there would be, in a few short years, an educational renaissance in the cities. For local community residents who have a meaningful voice in school affairs would soon develop feelings of power, high self-esteem, and more positive attitudes toward the schools. They would pass these positive attitudes on to their children who, in turn, would work harder to achieve school success which, in turn, would lead to improved academic achievement.

Urban school systems, as presently constituted, cannot solve Johnny's reading problem, say the critics, because the system is the cause of the problem. Therefore, the only way to solve the problem is to remove the cause. And the only way to remove the cause is through a basic realignment of the power relationships between the people who use the schools and the professionals who run the schools - to strip the professionals of their decision-making monopoly and force them to share power with local communities.

---

[16] The Bundy Report advocating the political decentralization of the New York City public school system was the first to enunciate these views.

Experiments in Community Control

The first experiments in community control of urban schools were conducted in the late 1960's and early 70's in New York City, Washington, D.C., Buffalo, New York, and Chicago, Illinois.[17]

New York City: In 1967, responding to local community demands, the Board of Education authorized the establishment of three Demonstration Districts - I.S. 201, Ocean Hill-Brownsville, and Two Bridges - to test the concept of community control. The three districts were in the poorest of minority areas where reading scores were among the lowest in the city. I.S. 201 (5 schools) was located in predominantly black Harlem, Ocean Hill-Brownsville (8 schools) in a mixed black/Puerto Rican area in Brooklyn, and Two Bridges (5 schools) in a multiracial lower-class area of Manhattan. Each district had its own locally elected Community School Board of teachers, parents, and community representatives which, in turn, had fairly broad powers in the areas of curriculum, personnel, and the budgeting of discretionary funds.

During their entire two year existence, the districts were under constant attack from the educational establishment. The most volatile issue was whether or not the community boards had the power to transfer teachers out of their districts. The controversy was so great that it engulfed and polarized the entire city and brought the school system to a near-complete halt through a series of teacher strikes.[18] Though the impasse was never satisfactorily resolved, the issue died when the districts were absorbed into larger units under the terms of the 1969 Decentralization Law.[19]

---

[17]The Anacostia Project in Washington, D.C. and the Southeast Alternatives Project in Minneapolis probably also qualify as "community control" experiments, but they are not included here because there is insufficient data in the literature on which to base an analysis.

[18]It is interesting to note that most of the teachers in the Demonstration Districts crossed picket lines to keep their schools open during the strikes. See Allan C. Ornstein, Urban Education: Student Unrest, Teacher Behaviors, and Black Power (Columbus: Chas. E. Merrill, 1972), p. 171.

[19]Mario D. Fantini, Marilyn Gittell, and Richard Magat, Community Control and the Urban School (New York: Praeger, 1970), p. 141-172.

But the Demonstration Districts were not complete failures. Studies by Gittell (1972) and Guttentag (1972) indicate that there were several positive effects of the experiment. These included (a) a significant increase in both the quantity and quality of community participation in school affairs, (b) more positive parent/student/teacher attitudes toward themselves, each other, and the schools, and (c) a marked improvement in academic achievement, especially in the primary grades.[20]

Washington, D.C.: The Morgan Community School, which served a predominantly black middle-class neighborhood, initially had broad support from both the community and the establishment. Its locally elected school board instituted a number of innovative programs and reading scores began to rise dramatically. But this success was short-lived. Conflicts with the central board over the delegation of increased power to the community, changes in Morgan School leadership, and divisiveness in the community soon wiped out the gains that had been made. By 1970, a small conservative clique had taken over the school and reading scores had dropped back to their previous lows for all grade levels. And the experiment was discontinued the following year.[21]

Although the Morgan School experiment was a "failure" for the adults, it was not without impact on the children. Gordon and Kassin (1971) report that, although academic achievement scores for upper grade students declined during the experimental period, the Morgan School's fourth graders reached national norms in both reading and math in the 1968-69 school year.[22]

---

[20]Marilyn Gittell, Local Control in Education: Three Demonstration School Districts in New York City (New York: Praeger, 1972); Marcia Guttentag, "Children in Harlem's Community Controlled Schools," Journal of Social Issues 28:4 (1972) 1-20.

[21]George R. LaNoue and Bruce L.R. Smith, The Politics of School Decentralization (Lexington: D.C. Heath, 1973), p. 96-102; Lawrence Feinberg, "Experiment Fades, Morgan School Goes Conventional," Washington Post 6 July 1971.

[22]Sol Gordon and Doris Kassin, The Morgan School, Washington, D.C. (New York: Center for Urban Education, 1971), p. 50-53.

Buffalo, New York: The BUILD Academy was established in 1969 as a cooperative venture involving BUILD (a local civil rights organization), the Buffalo Board of Education, and the New York State University at Buffalo after efforts to integrate the Buffalo school system failed. The school's eighteen member governing board includes community, university, and central board representatives with considerable authority over school operations. It is an "open enrollment" school with a student body of approximately 500 K-8 students from all areas of the city. Program improvements over the first ten years of its existence have increased reading scores at all grade levels to and above national norms. And, in 1975, another community controlled governing board was established for Buffalo's Woodlawn Junior High School at the request of the local community.[23]

Chicago, Illinois: The Woodlawn Experimental School District, which was active from 1968 to 1973, was initiated when the University of Chicago sought to establish an experimental school in the poor, black Woodlawn neighborhood adjacent to the university campus. After lengthy negotiations between the university, The Woodlawn Organization (a local community organization), and the Chicago Board of Education, a tripartite community board was created to govern the three schools in the project. Each group - the university, The Woodlawn Organization, and the central board of education - had one-third representation on the community board, and the concurrence of all three was required to implement any new plans for the schools. Numerous changes occurred in the schools under this arrangement, reading scores rose significantly, and community participation was at an all-time high. But the project was highly controversial and, when federal funds ran out, the central board would not continue funding on its own.[24]

Community Control - Was it Worth the Effort?

Of the four community control experiments just cited, only one - the BUILD Academy in Buffalo, New York, still exists. The others were abandoned primarily because of local community/central board conflicts which could not be satisfactorily resolved. The local boards wanted

---

[23]Frank Brown, "Community Control That Succeeded," Educational Forum 42:4 (May 1978) 451-457.

[24]John Fish, Black Power, White Control: The Struggle of the Woodlawn Organization in Chicago (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), p. 175-234; Peter Negronida, "Pupils Show Gains in Woodlawn Tests," Chicago Tribune, 25 Feb 1970.

more power and authority than their respective central boards were willing to allow. Some might say that the local boards went too far in attempting to achieve too much too quickly and that, if they had been able to work within the framework set down by their central boards, they might still be operating today. Others might say that the experiments didn't go far enough - that the local boards couldn't do what they needed to do because they didn't have the authority - and that the central boards who denied them that authority were obstructionist. Such arguments would be pointless, however, because the antagonists are firmly welded to their positions and refuse to see the other side's case.

The answer to the question, Were the community control experiments successful? lies in a determination of the purposes of the experiments and not in their survival rate. If the purposes were to "beat the system at its own game" and "take over" the schools from the professionals, then the experiments could definitely be considered to be failures because, in the end, the professionals won out over the amateurs. But if the purposes were to show the establishment that community people <u>are</u> capable of making their own decisions regarding their children's education, then a favorable response is in order. For the community control experiments proved, among other things, that:

...parents and community people <u>are</u> interested in improved educational opportunities for their children;

...they respond positively when presented with opportunities for <u>meaningful</u> participation in school affairs;

...they are willing to try out new ideas and experiment with new instructional materials which they think will be more effective than standard materials;

...they are willing to take a chance and "buck the system," if necessary, to achieve their goals.

The fact that, in all four experiments, academic achievement <u>did</u> improve is testimony to the communities' determination to succeed in building a better educational system for their children. Their inability to surmount the obstacles raised by the establishment should not be allowed to diminish their positive accomplishments. And their poor survival rate should properly be blamed on the establishment itself, and not on the people who tried to "make a go of it."

Decentralization and Community Control

To be effective, community control requires a decentralized system. And students of urban schools - Bundy in New York, Passow in Washington, D.C., and Havighurst in Chicago - have generally advocated some form of decentralization as a viable alternative to our highly centralized, bureaucratic structures.

The rationale for decentralization is that the bureaucratic system has become so large and impersonal that it is no longer capable of effectively meeting the needs of diverse populations. Decentralization, it is argued, will bring decision-making closer to the people and make the schools more responsive to their needs.

Since the late 1960's, most large urban school systems have instituted some kind of decentralization plan to (a) facilitate administrative decision-making, (b) improve school-community relations, and (c) place more emphasis on meeting local school needs. Most of these have involved the establishment of advisory councils at local school and sub-district levels which were useful for increasing community participation in school affairs but which did not lead to increased decision-making powers for local community residents. Only two systems - New York City and Detroit, Michigan - have attempted to combine decentralization with some form of community control.

New York City: For the past twelve years, New York City's public school system has been decentralized into 32 Community School Districts of approximately 20,000 students each with their own locally elected nine-member Community School Boards.

The Community School Boards have jurisdiction over all elementary and junior high schools in their districts and are authorized to (a) set overall policies for the district (consistent with central board policies), (b) appoint the district superintendent and select other staff as vacancies occur (from approved lists), (c) select instructional materials (from approved lists), (d) establish new instructional programs to meet special needs (as approved and funded by the central board), and (e) make recommendations to the central board on matters of special concern to the district. They have little or no control over the basic budgeting process, union contracts, staff qualifications, textbook approvals, capital improvements, or the basic educational program of the New York City Public Schools. They are, in effect, still sub-districts, because they are dependent on the central board for funding and project approvals. (The central board, which operates the

high schools and special education programs, consists of one representative from each of the city's five boroughs and two appointed by the mayor.)

Studies by Gittell (1973), Rebell (1973), and Fredericks (1974) indicate that, in the first few years of their existence, the Community School Boards had not made much headway in changing the New York City public school system. They attribute this to (a) ambiguities in the 1969 Decentralization Law, (b) restrictions placed on the districts by law and/or central board policies, (c) establishment opposition to the concept of community control, (d) divisive political power struggles within the districts themselves, and (e) timidity on the part of some local board members.

This does not mean, however, that no change has occurred. Changes have been noted within individual districts and within individual schools which, over time, may have contributed to noticeable improvements in academic achievement at both district and citywide levels. For example, Gittell (1973) notes that parent involvement in administrative staff selection and curriculum development in several districts led to a significant increase in community-oriented administrators and the establishment of a wide variety of new instructional programs for non-traditional students; Cronin et al. (1971) found that many of the Community School Boards actively lobbied the central board to obtain approvals and additional funding for innovative projects; and the Fleischman Commission (1973) urged the state to delegate more authority to the Community School Boards so that they could deal more effectively with the problems they faced. The consensus at the time seemed to be that, given half a chance, the Community School Boards could become a significant force for educational improvement in the City of New York.

Specific programs in individual schools and districts have been described by Morison (1974/1980), Rogers (1977), and Proshansky (1981). Of these, the Alternative Schools Program in East Harlem's District 4 has received the most publicity. This program, which has steadily expanded over the years to include 19 schools in 1982 (with two more on the way next year), involves the establishment of teacher-designed mini-schools-within-a-school to meet the needs of low-achieving black and Hispanic students. It is successful because it has the support of students, teachers, parents, and administrators in the district and costs no more than "regular" instructional programs. The result, says Proshansky, is more efficient staff utilization, lower operating costs, better teacher morale, and improved school-community relations.[25]

---

[25]Etta W. Proshansky, "Choice Not Chance in New York City," Social Policy 12:2 (Sept-Oct 1981) 24-45.

Table 1. New York City Reading Test Score Comparisons, 1973/74-1974/75

1. Citywide Analysis

Grade	% At/Above Grade Level 1973/74	% At/Above Grade Level 1974/75	Difference	% Over 73/74
2	48.5	60.3	+ 11.8	+ 24
3	36.4	44.4	+ 8.0	+ 22
4	31.9	40.2	+ 8.3	+ 26
5	36.9	51.7	+ 14.8	+ 40
6	36.4	56.4	+ 20.0	+ 55
7	32.4	52.3	+ 19.9	+ 61
8	38.6	52.9	+ 14.3	+ 37

2. District 4 Analysis

Grade	% At/Above Grade Level 1973/74	% At/Above Grade Level 1974/75	Difference	% Over 73/74
2	29.6	41.3	+ 11.7	+ 39
3	16.4	27.1	+ 10.7	+ 65
4	16.2	22.9	+ 6.7	+ 41
5	15.6	32.0	+ 16.4	+105
6	14.7	37.5	+ 22.8	+155
7	9.7	25.1	+ 15.4	+159
8	13.3	18.1	+ 4.8	+ 36

Source: Community School Profiles, 1973-74 and Community and High School Profiles, 1974-75 (New York City: Board of Education, 1975/76).

Empirical studies linking district level innovations with student achievement have apparently not been conducted. But, an examination of reading scores for 1973/74 and 1974/75 indicate that something is happening in New York City. Table 1 compares reading achievement in District 4 with citywide results for both years. At both levels - citywide and district - the percentage of students reading at or above grade level increased substantially. And, though District 4 students did not reach citywide levels, their increases were greater. The same pattern occurs when the data is organized vertically (from one year to the next), as in Table 2. With only one exception (second graders moving to third grade), the increase rates between the two tables ranged from a low of 10.4% to a high of 159%, with the most dramatic improvements occurring in District 4's middle grades.

Table 2. NYC Reading Test Score Comparisons, Vertical Analysis

1. Citywide Analysis

73/74 Grade	% At/Above Grade Level	74/75 Grade	% At/Above Grade Level	Difference	% Over 73/74
2	48.5	3	44.4	- 4.1	- 8.4
3	36.4	4	40.2	+ 3.8	+10.4
4	31.9	5	51.7	+19.8	+62.0
5	36.9	6	56.4	+19.5	+53.0
6	36.4	7	52.3	+15.9	+44.0
7	32.4	8	52.9	+20.5	+63.2

2. District 4 Analysis

73/74 Grade	% At/Above Grade Level	74/75 Grade	% At/Above Grade Level	Difference	% Over 73/74
2	29.6	3	27.1	- 2.5	- 8.4
3	16.4	4	22.9	+ 6.5	+40.0
4	16.2	5	32.0	+15.8	+97.5
5	15.6	6	37.5	+21.9	+140.0
6	14.7	7	25.1	+10.4	+71.0
7	9.7	8	18.1	+ 8.4	+86.5

Source: Community School Profiles, 1973-74 and Community and High School Profiles, 1974-75 (New York City: Board of Education, 1975/76).

If it is valid to judge the "success" of a school district by the rate at which its students reach grade level, then we would have to give New York City's District 4 a few words of praise, for the citywide achievement levels cannot increase without increases at the district level. Then we would have to ask ourselves why this improvement occurred. Did the students all of a sudden get smart? Did the teachers all of a sudden get wise? Did the district administrators do something that made the difference? Or was it the Community School Board? We do not know. All we know for certain is that the 1969 Decentralization Law establishing the Community School Districts gave them certain powers in the areas of curriculum, personnel, and discretionary budgeting, that District 4 took advantage of these powers, and that this just might have been a factor.[26]

[26]It might be interesting to do an up-to-date study of the "grade level rates" for a number of large urban school systems, including Chicago, to see if any differences occur between centralized and "decentralized" governance structures. Or, to compare Chicago's "success" rate with Cook County's independent school districts.

Detroit, Michigan: The Detroit public school system, which has recently recentralized, was decentralized for eleven years (1970-1981) into eight regions governed by locally elected five-member Regional School Boards under the overall supervision of a thirteen-member central board consisting of one representative from each region and five at-large elected members. Local school councils were established to act in an advisory capacity to local school administrators and the regional boards.

The regional boards had jurisdiction over all schools in their districts with authority over curriculum and instruction, selection and tenure of the regional superintendent, community use of school facilities, budgeting of funds allocated by the central board, and assignment of personnel within central board guidelines. The central board had final authority in matters of finance, personnel (including faculty desegregation), union contracts, capital improvements, special education programs, and delivery of various citywide services to the districts.

Evidence of the effectiveness of the Detroit system is virtually non-existent. Glass and Sanders (1978) studied the governance structure and concluded that most parents and community leaders were satisfied with the arrangement; Jefferson (1979) praised the city's efforts to peacefully integrate the schools; Gipson and Hall (1976) explained the role of local universities in developing leadership training programs for local school council/board members; and Popham and Rankin (1980) discussed the system's competency-based proficiency testing program. But none of these writers related their findings to the effect(s) of the region-based governance structure on student achievement.

The only clue we have as to what happened in Detroit academically is Popham and Rankin's report that 81% of the city's tenth and eleventh graders recently passed the reading section of a newly devised citywide proficiency test, a feat which could not have been accomplished without regional district cooperation, while a good portion of those same students "flunked" the math portion of the test.[27] We cannot, however, conclude from this that the regional governance structure "made the difference" in the test results, because we do not know what changes, if any, the regions made in their instructionsl programs. We can only say that apparently Detroit as a whole has placed more emphasis on improving reading skills than it has on improving math skills.

---

[27]James W. Popham and Stuart C. Rankin, "Detroit's Measurement Driven Instruction," Educational Leadership 38:3 (Dec 1980) 208-209.

Decentralization – Is It The Answer?

On the basis of the evidence presented so far, it would be inappropriate to conclude that the type of decentralization implemented in New York City and Detroit is "the answer" to the problems of large urban school systems. The literature on both systems, especially New York, indicates that dual governance structures present serious political problems which are not easily resolved. The constant tugs-of-war between central boards and local community/regional boards over various "prerogatives" creates a hostile atmosphere which is detrimental to the welfare of the system as a whole and does nothing to improve academic achievement.

It is especially difficult, in a dual governance system, to determine which level is responsible for whatever improvements do occur. Some educational programs are sponsored by the central board, while others are sponsored by local boards. Both may be dealing with the same subject matter - reading, for example - and so, whatever happens with the program, both levels may take credit or blame. Additionally, the local boards are dependent on the central boards for program approvals and funding. Good programs may be lost because the central board would not approve or fund them; or, poor programs might be approved because they are "cheap." And, we must remember that, in a dual system, the central board "skims" funds off the top to meet its own needs before making district allocations. Thus, the local boards are limited in what they can do; they must always work within the framework set by the central board.

This does not mean, however, that other forms of decentralized school governance will not work. The educational improvements cited for New York City indicate that, even in a troubled situation, substantial progress can be made on both local and citywide levels when local boards have some freedom, however limited, to initiate their own instructional programs and, for this reason alone, the search for a viable urban school governance structure ought to continue.

The solution to the problem lies in one of two directions - either (a) clarify the relationships between the two governance levels so as to eliminate jurisdictional disputes or (b) eliminate one of the governance levels. New York City has adopted the first approach, utilizing the courts and state level governmental structures in several instances to resolve central/community board conflicts. Detroit took the second route and eliminated the regional boards. A third option - that of eliminating the central board entirely and granting full autonomy to the local boards - has yet to be tried.

COMMUNITY CONTROL: WILL IT WORK IN CHICAGO?

With the exception of those who were involved in the Woodlawn Experimental School District, Chicagoans did not get caught up in the emotional rhetoric of the late 1960's regarding the issue of school governance. The major concerns of the past twenty years have revolved around the issues of desegregation, quality education, and finance. Governance issues were related primarily to questions of how school board members should be selected, and not to the basic structure of the school system itself. Still, under the surface, there has been a gradual awakening in the City of Chicago, a realization that "the people" really have no control over the educational system. Those who could afford it "voted with their feet" by moving to the suburbs or enrolling their children in parochial and private schools. Those who could not have become increasingly vocal in their criticisms of the school system.

The present surge of interest in school governance issues in the City of Chicago is directly related to the failures of the present centralized system to effectively address the educational and financial problems which have plagued it for so long. And community control of public schools is an integral part of the governance issue. For the only alternative to a centralized system is a decentralized system. And community control is an option which must be explored, if we are truly interested in changing the school system.

The term "community control" has been variously defined in the literature as an attempt to grant power to the powerless in regard to the education of their children. Originally, the "powerless" were defined as the non-white ethnic minorities who populate the nation's inner-city ghettos. And, although this is still the primary definition, it has been expanded to include large segments of the majority white population as well. For they have been similarly deprived and, in recent years, have become increasingly disillusioned with public education. The issue has gone beyond race to a generalized backlash against bureaucratic rule. And this is tied to the fairly recent national trend against government rule in general spurred by negative reactions to the "impersonal" society.

The Search for Community

We all have a need to "belong" somewhere, to be a member of a community which we can rightfully call our own. Our sense of community is an important aspect of our identity, for when we have community, we rise above ourselves to identify with, and work for, a greater good. We develop a proprietary interest in the community. It becomes our home, a refuge from the outside world. The people who live there become our friends and neighbors in a more than casual way. The neighborhood becomes "our" neighborhood. The church down the street becomes "our" church. And the school around the corner becomes "our" school.

A community, says Webster, is "a unified body of individuals" with common interests and/or common characteristics linked together by a common policy who interact with each other in a particular location or area within a larger society.[28] The implication is that, generally speaking, communities are self-defined by self-selected individuals and that membership in the community is conditional. It is not enough to merely live in a particular location to be a member of that community. One must also take an interest in, identify with, and make a commitment to, the community.

The City of Chicago is a collection of 77 such self-defined communities which, at times, may band together to support some common cause, but which often are at odds with each other because of their conflicting needs and value systems. What is good for South Chicago may not be good for Jefferson Park, for they are miles apart physically, culturally, and psychologically. One is a predominantly low-income Hispanic area; the other a predominantly moderate-income white area. Even Hyde Park on the South Side and Lincoln Park on the North Side - two communities with similar value systems - have different needs which must be addressed. The same could be said for any other local community within the city limits. No two communities are alike. They each have their own special qualities and their own unique ways of doing things.

When a priest, or a rabbi, or a minister goes into a community, his first loyalty outside of the church is to that community. He makes

---

[28] Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. (Springfield: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1967), p. 168.

it his business to go out into the community, to meet the people and get to know them, to find out what their needs are and to do what he can to meet those needs. He takes an interest in, identifies with, and makes a commitment to, that community. He is a member of that community; he "belongs." The people accept him (and his church) because he has met the conditions for membership, and not because he has imposed the will of some higher authority upon them. The consequence of this "reaching out" strategy is, in most communities, a positive church/community relationship.

Chicago's public schools make no such commitment to the local community. They are isolated islands, unconnected with the people they are supposed to serve. Principals and teachers are not encouraged to take an interest in, identify with, or make a commitment to, the community. They do not "belong," because their loyalties are to an anonymous higher authority which reserves to itself the right to make decisions as to what is "best" for the local community. Schools are tolerated by many people as a necessary evil because (a) the law says all children must go to school and (b) most parents want their children to be educated. But the schools are not always accepted as legitimate members of the community because they have not met the conditions for membership. And therein lies one cause of school/community alienation. For if the school has no commitment to the community, why should the community be committed to the school?

The Need for Control

In addition to our need for a sense of community, we also have a need to control our own lives. We need to make our own decisions, carry them out, and suffer or enjoy the consequences all by ourselves. When we make good decisions, we are elated, and our self-esteem rises accordingly. When we make poor decisions, we are dejected and lose some of our self-confidence. But at least we know that it was our own decision, not someone else's, and the praise or blame for the result belongs to noone but ourselves.

Another cause of school/community alienation is the lack of local community input into the schools' decision-making process. Although parents are primarily responsible for the education of their children, they have no voice in determining the kind of education their children get. Decisions are made for them by a person or persons unknown who have only minimal interest in meeting their needs. Decisions on pupil

placement, school boundaries, curriculum and instruction, personnel, and finance are pre-determined by the schoolmen at the top of the hierarchy, passed down the chain of command, and implemented by principals and teachers who have no choice but to "go along" with the system. The students and their parents who depend upon the system to meet their educational needs are left completely out of the picture.

The natural reaction of many parents, teachers, and students is to withdraw from a situation over which they have no control. Such withdrawal may be physical, as in absenteeism, excessive tardiness, or drop-out, or it may be psychological, as in "going through the motions" without really being there. Others react more overtly by actively fighting the system. Discipline and vandalism problems increase, school boycotts and demonstrations are staged, and campaigns to "get" a particular person - usually a principal or a teacher - are launched. Efforts by the central administration to reduce, and hopefully eliminate, these problems are usually ineffective because they do not address the underlying problem, which is the unresponsiveness of the centralized system to the needs of the local communities.

It is true that, in Chicago, we have parent advisory councils at the local school and sub-district levels which are supposed to work with the local administrators to help solve local problems. But these groups are not in a position to impact on the system and demand a redress of grievances. For they are small, carefully selected groups which have been coopted by the local administrator and their primary function, as far as the administration is concerned, is to ratify decisions already made and possibly assist in helping the community understand and accept them.

The recent flap over the Graham-Hendricks integration plan is a case in point. The decision to pair the schools and encourage permissive transfers was made in the central office by a handful of desegregation experts who had no knowledge of the Graham-Hendricks communities. To them, it was a simple matter of a few children walking a few blocks in opposite directions to meet the demands of a numbers game. They were totally unprepared for the emotional outbursts of anger which emanated from both communities when the plan was unveiled. And they were forced to beat a hasty retreat.

Community Control - A Practical Solution?

In a community-controlled situation, the Graham-Hendricks integration dispute might never have occurred. For the members of the locally elected Community School Board would have been aware of the demographic and social realities of the area and would have taken those factors into consideration before making a decision. And the neighborhood residents, who elected the Community School Board, might have been more willing to cooperate with the plan, especially if they, or their representatives, were involved in the planning process.

The primary advantage of community control of urban schools is that it brings the decision-making process down to its lowest possible level - the local community - and provides an opportunity for the ordinary citizen to take an active role in school governance. Lowering the locus of power is known to increase members' motivation to produce, identify with, and get involved in, an organization. And participative decision-making has a positive effect on such variables as self-discipline, initiative-taking, and efficiency.[29] Studies by Noack (1972) in Seattle, Washington, and Skeen (1974) in Buffalo, New York, clearly indicate that parents and students in a community-controlled environment are more satisfied with their schools than those in a traditional, centrally-controlled environment. And Fainstein and Martin (1978) found substantial levels of support for community control among both white and minority adults in New York City.

Though the term "community control" is rarely used, the people of the City of Chicago have also expressed a need and desire for a "lowering of the locus of power" in regard to the public schools. This is evident in their frequent resistance to centrally mandated changes in school organization, curriculum, instruction, and personnel. It is as if they are saying: "Hey, wait a minute. What about us? Don't we count any more? Or are we just pawns of the central administration?" These reactions have less to do with the merits or demerits of the particular program or plan at issue than they have to do with the peoples' need to be involved in the important decisions which impact on their lives. And the education of their children is of vital concern to them.

---

[29]Barbara R. Hatton, "Community Control in Retrospect: A Review of Strategies for Community Participation in Education," in Community Participation in Education, ed. Carl A. Grant (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1979), p. 15.

This concern is clearly evident in the results obtained by the Citizens Schools Committee (1982) in a recent study of public attitudes toward community participation in school affairs. Of 554 respondents to a 1980 Sun-Times survey sponsored by CSC, 81.6% favored community involvement in staff evaluations, 52.9% supported the use of local school selection committees for hiring teachers, and 57.2% favored community involvement in the selection of principals.[30]

Although this study cannot be conclusively accepted as "the will of the people," it is interesting to note that, even in this small, self-selected sample, there is much support for greater community input into local school affairs. The findings are even more significant when one realizes that 69.9% of the respondents were educators themselves. For it is among professional educators that one would expect to find strong resistance to community control. Yet here we find a sizable group of educators who actually favor greater community involvement in the decision-making process.

The Political Implications of Community Control

Opposition to community control of Chicago's public schools is likely to come primarily from the upper echelons of the school bureaucracy, organized labor, and the city's political power structure. These three groups have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo and would feel directly threatened by any change in the schools' governance structure. As of now, they have all the power, and would be most reluctant to relinquish any of it to the local communities. For they derive their strength from the centralized system and are powerless without it.

If Chicago's local communities, through locally elected Community School Boards, had the power to select personnel, set the budget, levy taxes, and determine educational priorities for their areas, a total realignment of the power relationships within the school system would result. All authority over school operations would pass from the central board to the local boards; school employees would shift their loyalties to the local communities; contract terms would vary according to local needs and desires; instructional programs would be developed locally to meet local needs; tax monies would go directly to the local boards (who would deal directly with the state and federal governments for

[30]Citizens Schools Committee, Better Schools for All Chicago: A School Accountability Study (Chicago: Citizens Schools Committee, 1982), Appendix A.

additional funding); the local boards would "own" all school property in their areas; etc. There would be no need for a centralized board with its strong ties to the city's banking, real estate, labor, business, and/or political interest groups. Financial matters would be handled individually by the local boards, forcing the special interest groups to openly compete with each other for school contracts which they previously took for granted. And local board members, if they are skillful negotiators, might be able to get more favorable terms than those previously negotiated by the central board.

The chances of developing such a community-controlled school system in the City of Chicago without alienating the special interest groups are slim. For the special interest groups do not want, or need, community control of public schools. It is not in their best interests to have to deal with multiple school boards when one will do just as well for what they want. They would lose much of their bargaining power under such a system, for they would no longer be able to hold the entire city hostage to their demands, but would have to negotiate with one district at a time - just as they do in the suburbs.

Community Control - The Suburban Model

The dual governance system, as witnessed in Detroit and New York City, is intended primarily to meet the needs of the special interest groups and not necessarily to transfer power to the local communities. The only way to actually transfer power to the communities is to establish independent, autonomous school districts, subject only to the authority of the state. And the only way to do this is to follow the suburban model of school governance.

There are 143 independent, autonomous school districts in the suburban Cook County area which surrounds the City of Chicago. Of these, 115 are elementary school districts, 27 are high school districts, and one (Elmwood Park) is a unit (K-12) district.[31] Each district is administered by its own locally elected school board which, subject only to the state authority, has all the powers and duties outlined in Article 10 of the Illinois School Code. The districts

[31]A number of suburban areas have multiple school districts. The most are found in Skokie (pop. 68,911), which has five separate elementary school districts serving approximately 5,200 students in fifteen schools.

vary considerably in size, tax base, income levels, ethnic composition, and academic achievement, yet, overall, they seem to do a "better" job than most city schools - or at least we seem to think they do.

Does this mean that, somehow, suburban children and their teachers are "smarter" or "better" than their urban counterparts - that, to achieve school success or to be a "good" teacher, all one need do is relocate to suburbia? Of course not. There are no such intrinsic differences between suburban and urban dwellers and/or suburban and urban teachers. But there are differences in public attitudes toward, and perceived control of, the public schools.

The critical differences between urban and suburban school systems, says O'Shea (1975), are that (a) suburban school systems are dependent on the local electorate for financial support, and (b) suburbanites are better able to mobilize community resources on behalf of their demands for quality education. Suburban school boards and administrators listen and respond to the community because they have to. For if they don't, the community can very easily mobilize itself to pressure school administrators, remove incumbent board members, and/or defeat tax referenda. And, in the State of Illinois, they even have the power to change the school system itself if they so desire.[32]

It is this kind of subtle "ballot box" control that Chicago's local communities need if they are ever to have a school system that is responsive to their needs. Right now, they are powerless. For Chicago's school authorities owe no allegiance to the local communities which, under present Illinois law, do not have the power to vote them out of office or defeat tax referenda. Their allegiance is to the special interest groups who are in a position to secure political and financial support to maintain the system. And, in exchange for that support, they are honor bound to give priority to the needs of the special interest groups - even if it means shortchanging the children.

---

[32]Article 7 of the Illinois School Code outlines procedures for the creation of new school districts "by detachment, annexation, division, dissolution or consolidation or any combination thereof...when petitioned by the boards of each district affected or by a majority of the legal voters residing in each district affected or by two-thirds of the legal voters residing in any territory proposed to be detached from one or more districts or in each of one or more districts proposed to be annexed to or consolidated with another district." (emphasis added)

Addressing the Needs of Diverse Populations

It would not be too difficult, under Illinois law, to reorganize Chicago's public schools into a multiple district system. There is ample provision in Articles 7, 10, and 11 of the Illinois School Code for making a variety of changes in school district organization throughout the state - provisions which are equally applicable to the City of Chicago. The problem lies in developing a comprehensive, orderly transition plan, properly supervised by the appropriate authorities, which will, at the same time, protect the educational rights of non-traditional students - blacks, Hispanics, the handicapped, and the gifted.

Legislation governing the education of non-traditional students is outlined in Articles 14 (Handicapped), 14A (Gifted), 14B (Disadvantaged), and 14C (Bilingual Education) of the Illinois School Code. Handicapped and bilingual education programs are state mandated; disadvantaged and gifted programs are not.[33] All non-traditional educational programs are eligible for state and/or federal reimbursement to varying degrees and are subject to prior approval by the State Superintendent of Education and/or state-level Advisory Councils.

Children who meet the criteria for placement into one or the other of the handicapped/bilingual categories are, under Illinois law, automatically entitled to certain special considerations regardless of the type of school district. There are no exceptions - every school district in the state is required to establish special programs for non-traditional handicapped/bilingual students which show the greatest promise for helping them succeed in school. And, if they can't, they have the option of either (a) purchasing the necessary services from another public or private educational facility, or (b) joining with other districts to establish joint programs to meet the need.[34]

The student population of the Chicago public school system is predominantly non-traditional - 61% black, 20% Hispanic, 17% white, 2% Asian.[35] This means that the traditional white middle-class

[33]Article 14B (Disadvantaged) was written to comply with the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a federally funded program.

[34]Illinois School Code, Articles 14-7.01, 14-7.02, 14C-5, and 10-22.31.

[35]Chicago Board of Education brochure, undated.

educational strategy will not "work" for many of these students. Those whose first language is not English will need bilingual education; those who come from poverty-striken environments will need "compensatory" education; and those who are mentally or physically handicapped to any significant degree will need special programs geared to their needs.

The Chicago Board of Education has established a number of educational programs designed to meet the needs of non-traditional students. Most areas of the city which have a sufficient student population to support such programs have been served, one way or another, over the years. But there has been much controversy over the adequacy of these programs, mainly because they have been centrally administered according to standardized formulas without regard for individual needs. Students have been misplaced in special education programs, misserved by unqualified teachers, and/or completely ignored by the administration. And often, when budget cuts are made, non-traditional programs are the first to feel the pinch.

In a multiple district system, the local Community School Boards might be able to correct some of these non-traditional educational program deficiencies. For they would have a smaller territory to cover and fewer students to worry about. And they would have the authority, under state law, to revise and upgrade these programs in accordance with local needs before submitting their proposals to the state for approval.

A multiple district system might also make it easier for the state to administer entitlement programs. Categorical funds would go to those districts most in need of supplemental assistance and would be less likely to be commingled with regular educational funds. Auditing and evaluation functions might be carried out more efficiently, errors might be spotted quickly, and program adjustments might be handled more effectively in smaller systems.

It is entirely possible, of course, that none of these things would happen - that the Community School Districts would not upgrade their non-traditional educational programs to meet local needs and that state-level administration and supervision of the programs would not be any more effective than under the present system. There is no way of telling what the results of the change might actually be until the change is made. It might be better or it might not, but there are those who would say that it couldn't get much worse.

The Equal Opportunity Mandate

Segregation has been a way of life in the City of Chicago for many years. And resistance to desegregation remains strong in many of the city's white communities. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect that some whites will support the establishment of a community-controlled multi-district school system as a mechanism for avoiding integration. It should be made clear at the outset that the purpose of restructuring the school system is to enable local communities to have a greater voice in school governance, and not to perpetuate the segregated system.

Equal educational opportunity for all children in the State of Illinois is mandated by Articles 10-21.3, 10-22.5, and 34-18 of the Illinois School Code, as well as by the United States Supreme Court. And we are honor bound, like it or not, to carry out that mandate. The question is no longer "should we or shouldn't we" but "how" can we best meet our obligations to minority children. Three issues are involved:

1. The drawing of Community School District boundary lines.

2. The prevention of segregation within the Community School Districts.

3. The fate of the desegregation programs established by the present board in accordance with the 1980 consent decree.

If the boundary lines of the newly created Community School Districts were drawn in such a way so as to isolate the major racial/ethnic groups from one another and/or to dilute the voting strength of any particular group(s), the action would probably be declared unconstitutional by both state and federal courts. This issue might be resolved by conducting appropriate demographic studies before these decisions are made. Contiguous minority and majority areas of the city could be "paired" or "clustered" to create the maximum possible number of multi-cultural districts and the minimum number of isolated districts. Present community boundaries could be utilized to help effect such pairings or clusterings - for example, Mt. Greenwood, Beverly, Morgan Park, and Washington Heights could be clustered to create a multi-cultural (albeit segregated) Community School District on the southwest side. And Austin, Montclare, Belmont-Cragin, Dunning, and Portage Park could be clustered to create a multi-cultural Community School District on

the northwest side. Similar clusters, based on accurate demographic information from the 1980 census, could be created throughout the city to form the Community School Districts.

If the children residing within the boundaries of the Community School Districts were forced to remain in their present "neighborhood" schools under the attendance area boundaries set by the present administration, opportunities for quality, integrated education would probably be minimal. To avoid this possibility, it might be wise to mandate "open enrollment" in the newly formed districts and require each district, within a specified period of time, to submit an integration plan to state authorities.

If Article 34 were repealed and the present Chicago Board of Education was abolished in favor of the multi-district system, the consent decree with the Justice Department would probably be null and void, but the new districts would not be relieved of the obligation to take affirmative action on their own to prevent segregation in their areas. Again, the solution is to require the newly formed districts to evaluate existing desegregation programs established in their areas by the present board and to present plans to the appropriate authorities as to how they intend to retain, modify, or expand on such programs.

Another way of promoting integration in a multi-district system might be to separate the high schools from the Community School Districts and establish a citywide, centrally-administered "open enrollment" high school district which also would be required to develop desegregation plans.

Paying the Freight

The final, most important, point to be considered in any plan to reorganize the Chicago public schools into a multi-district system is the method of finance and distribution of funds to the local school districts. Here again, we can be guided by state law.

Table 3 compares the maximum basic legal tax rates for the City of Chicago Board of Education with the rates allowed for school districts under 500,000 population as of 1977 in the State of Illinois.[36]

[36]These are not the only factors to be taken into account in discussing the financial implications of Senate Bill 286. But, this writer is not qualified to make such a complicated analysis, and so will limit this discussion to a comparison of the basic financial structures applicable to all school districts in the state.

Table 3: Tax Rate Comparisons for Chicago Board of Education vs. School Districts under 500,000 Population as of 1977, State of Illinois.

Fund	Unit	Elem.	High	Chicago
Education	1.60	.92	.92	2.11
Operations/Buildings	.375	.25	.25	.45
Capital Improvements	.06	.06	.06	?
Transportation	.12	.12	.12	.005*
Summer School	.15	.15	.15	?
Life Safety**	.05	.05	.05	?
Special Ed. Buildings**	.04	.02	.02	?
Vocational Ed. Buildings**	.05	.05	.05	?
Textbook	?	?	?	.11
Playgrounds	?	?	?	.06
Working Cash	?	?	?	.05
Totals 1	2.445	1.62	1.62 (3.24)	2.785[a]

*TMH pupils only.
**Only if the operations/building fund is exhausted, and with prior state approval.
[a]Chicago's present school tax rate is 3.597.
Source: Illinois School Code (1977), Articles 17 and 34.

Although some of this data is obsolete due to recent changes in state law, it is still instructive to examine it to see just what the relationships are, financially speaking, between different types of school districts in the State of Illinois.

The first conclusion one must come to is that different types of school districts not only have different tax rates but that those tax rates are for different purposes. Chicago has tax rates not applicable to other districts in the state, and vice versa. It is on the basis of this type of information that several bills were introduced into the state legislature last year to enable the Chicago Board of Education to achieve "parity" with other school districts.

The second thing that is immediately noticeable is that, of the four categories, Chicago has the most favorable overall tax rate. The other districts, if they want to go beyond the statutory rate, are obliged to submit the issue to the voters in their areas, who are often reluctant to approve tax increases.

The third conclusion we can reach is that, although Chicago's overall tax rate is greater than the tax rate for other districts, areas which have separate elementary and high school districts get the "best" deal financially at a combined rate of 3.24.

On the basis of this limited information, it might be wise to consider establishing a dual district structure in the City of Chicago - one high school district plus several independent, autonomous elementary districts. The tax rate might go down a bit, but not as much as it would if unit districts were established.

There are two ways in which education funds could be distributed in such a newly formed dual district structure. Taxes could be levied citywide and distributed to the districts on a per-pupil basis, or each district could be granted the authority to levy its own taxes. Each method has advantages and disadvantages.

The first - to levy a citywide tax - has the advantage of ensuring an equitable distribution of all available education funds. It would also make it easier for funds to be "skimmed" off the top to retire the indebtedness of the present Chicago Board of Education. But the districts would not be completely autonomous under this arrangement and would probably have difficulty raising additional funds for special projects. And then there is the question of who should have the authority to distribute the funds - the County Clerk, the School Finance Authority (which may or may not be retained in the new system), or some other central authority.

The second - to grant taxing authority to the districts - would almost assuredly result in financial inequities between districts because they would not all have the same tax base. But they would be totally independent in this regard and they might stand a better chance of passing tax increases for special projects. They could still be required to contribute to a centrally-administered "debt retirement" fund, but they would not be dependent on that central authority for basic funding.

The answers to these questions cannot be determined until a thorough study is made comparing the possible outcomes of the various options. But these are the questions which must be considered and they are raised here primarily to provide food for thought.

CONCLUSION

Whether or not a community-controlled multi-district school system will "work" in the City of Chicago depends on a number of factors. It would need, first of all, strong support from the people and the establishment. And, secondly, it would need to be carefully planned and implemented. For without public support, a good plan will fail. And without a good plan, public support will fade.

There are no guarantees that changing the school governance structure will improve public education in the City of Chicago. To take such a step is an act of faith - faith that the people will elect knowledgable community leaders to the Community School Boards, that the Community School Boards will "take care of business" in a responsible manner, that school personnel will finally feel free to search for new alternatives to our educational problems, and that "Johnny" will benefit in the long run. These things might or might not happen if we switch to a multi-district system. But we will not know until we try, for we cannot predict the outcome in advance.

So the final question is: Are we willing to take a chance? Do we have enough faith in ourselves and in our fellow citizens to believe that we can "run" the schools as well as, or better than, the professionals? Or are we willing to accept a school system in which the vast majority of our high school students score below the 30th percentile on standardized reading and math tests?

The answers to these questions must come from the people. For, in the final analysis, it is the people who stand to gain or lose the most from the educational system. For it is their children's futures which are at stake. And if they do not assume an advocacy role on behalf of their own children, who will?

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools. Report to the Board of Education, City of Chicago. Chicago: Board of Education, 1964.

Brown, Frank. "Community Control That Succeeded." Educational Forum 42:4 (May 1978) 451-457.

Bundy, McGeorge, et al. Reconnection for Learning: A Community School System for New York City. New York: Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of New York City Schools, 1967.

Burges, Bill. "Rx for School Governance." Journal of Education 159:1 (Feb 1977) 43-47.

Citizens Schools Committee. "How the Principal Selection Guidelines are Working." CSC Report 1:12 (June 1978) 4, 8-9.

Citizens Schools Committee. Better Schools for All Chicago: A School Accountability Study. Chicago: Citizens Schools Committee, 1982.

Cibulka, James G. "School Decentralization in Chicago." Education and Urban Society 7:4 (August 1975) 412-438.

Coleman, Peter. The Perils of Bigness: The Case Against Large School Systems. Unpublished paper, 1971. ED 059 529.

Cronin, Joseph M. The Control of Urban Schools: Perspectives on the Power of Educational Reformers. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Fainstein, Norman L. and Martin, Mark. "Support for Community Control Among Local Urban Elites." Urban Affairs Quarterly 13:4 (June 1978) 43-68.

Fantini, Mario D. "Participation, Decentralization, Community Control and Quality Education." Teachers College Record 71:1 (Sept 1969) 93-107.

Fantini, Mario D., Gittell, Marilyn, and Magat, Richard. Community Control and the Urban School. New York: Praeger, 1970.

Fein, Leonard J. The Ecology of the Public Schools: An Inquiry Into Community Control. New York: Pegasus, 1971.

Feinberg, Lawrence. "Experiment Fades, Morgan School Goes Conventional." Washington Post 6 July 1971.

Fish, John. Black Power, White Control: The Struggle of the Woodlawn Organization in Chicago. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.

Fleischman, Manly. State Commission on the Quality, Cost, and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education. New York: Viking Press, 1973.

Fredericks, Stephen J. "Curriculum and Decentralization: The New York City Public School System." Urban Education 9:3 (Oct 1974) 247-256.

Gipson, Joella H. and Hall, Burnis. "Decentralization and Community Involvement in the School System - The Example of Detroit." Trends in Education 3 (1976) 35-38.

Gittell, Marilyn and Hollander, T. Edward. Six Urban School Districts: A Comparative Study of Institutional Response. New York: Praeger, 1968.

Gittell, Marilyn, et al. Local Control in Education. Three Demonstration School Districts in New York City. New York: Praeger, 1972.

Gittell, Marilyn, et al. School Boards and School Policy: An Evaluation of Decentralization in New York City. New York: Praeger, 1973.

Glass, Thomas E. and Sanders, William A. Community Control in Education: A Study in Power Transition. Midland: Pendell, 1978.

Gordon, Sol and Kassin, Doris. The Morgan School, Washington, D.C. New York: Center for Urban Education, 1971. ED 061 375.

Guttentag, Marcia. "Children in Harlem's Community-Controlled Schools." Journal of Social Issues 28:4 (1972) 1-20.

Hatton, Barbara R. "Community Control in Retrospect: A Review of Strategies for Community Participation in Education." In Community Participation in Education, pp. 2-20. Edited by Carl A. Grant. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1979.

Havighurst, Robert J. The Public Schools of Chicago: A Survey for the Board of Education. Chicago: Board of Education, 1964.

Herrick, Mary J. The Chicago Schools: A Social and Political History. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1971.

Illinois Office of Education. The School Code of Illinois, 1977. St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1977.

Jefferson, Arthur. "Detroit's Educational Renaissance." Crisis 86:3 (March 1979) 87-94.

Jennings, James. "Community Control: A Grassroots Response." Journal of Education 161:4 (Fall 1979) 73-87.

LaNoue, George R. and Smith, Bruce L.R. The Politics of School Decentralization. Lexington: D.C. Heath, 1973.

Morison, Sidney H. "Decentralization 5 Years On: A Principal's View." Urban Review 7:3 (July 1974) 197-206.

Morison, Sidney H. "The Politics of Decentralization." National Elementary Principal 59:4 (June 1980) 58-60.

Napier, Shirley. Community Control of Education, A Concept Paper. Unpublished paper, 1979. ED 177 241.

Negronida, Peter. "Pupils Show Gains in Woodlawn Tests." Chicago Tribune 25 Feb 1970.

New York City Board of Education. Community School Profiles, 1973-74. New York: Board of Education, 1975. ED 135 117.

New York City Board of Education. Community and High School Profiles 1974-75. New York: Board of Education, 1975. ED 135 118.

Noack, Ernest G. S. "The Satisfaction of Parents with Their Community Schools as a Measure of Effectiveness of the Decentralization of a School System." Journal of Educational Research 65:8 (April 1972) 355-356.

Orfield, Gary. Voluntary Desegregation in Chicago: A Report to Joseph Cronin, State Superintendent of Education. Unpublished paper, 1979.

Ornstein, Allan C. Urban Education: Student Unrest, Teacher Behaviors, and Black Power. Columbus: Chas. E. Merrill, 1972.

Ornstein, Allan C. "Decentralization and Community Control." Educational Forum 39:4 (May 1975) 449-463.

Ornstein, Allan C. "Decentralization - Is It Working?" Principal 61:2 (Nov 1981) 24-27.

O'Shea, David W. Urban Community Control: What Can We Learn from the Suburban Experience? Unpublished paper, 1975. ED 105 035.

Peterson, Paul E. School Politics, Chicago Style. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Popham, James W. and Rankin, Stuart C. "Detroit's Measurement Driven Instruction." Educational Leadership 38:3 (Dec 1980) 208-209.

Rebell, Michael A. "New York's School Decentralization Law: Two and a Half Years Later." Journal of Law and Education 2:1 (Jan 1973) 1-39.

Reed, Rodney J. "The Community School Board." School Review 81:3 (May 1973) 357-364.

Skeen, Elois M. "A Community-Controlled School: The Effects on Student Perceptions of Locus of Control." Journal of Black Studies 5:2 (Dec 1974) 210-224.

Thomas, Henrietta K. Community Control of Public Schools. Unpublished paper, 1979.

Tyack, David B. The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1967.

Weinberg, Meyer. "Educational Bureaucracy and Educational Change." Integrated Education 7:5 (Sept-Oct 1969) 39-48.

Young, Whitney M., Jr. "Minorities and Public School Decentralization." Journal of Negro Education 38:3 (Summer 1969) 285-290.

Point of View: Selected Quotations from the Harper (1898), Strayer (1932), and Havighurst (1964) Reports

Harper	Strayer	Havighurst
...the essential purpose of the American school system is to form American citizens, and all proper means should be employed to make of all children in our public schools ...men and women whose hearts are centered in our life. (p. 131)	...the school must be so organized and managed as to afford an appropriate environment and an equalized opportunity for boys and girls to grow to the fullest educational stature to which they are capable. (p. 72)	The most important challenge facing the City of Chicago as it considers the program of public education is the challenge to provide adequately for the education of socially disadvantaged children. (p. 57)
...one high school graduate will do more for the city and be a larger factor in the commercial, industrial, social and political life of the community, than any average four or five who have finished only the course of the elementary schools. (p. 101)	...the present secondary school practice in Chicago seems to support the concept that education is something to be got, labeled, passed, certified, and recorded. (p. 91)	The tendency in ... recent years has been ... to push as many students as possible into a standard college preparatory program, whether or not they are going to college. (p. 236)
There are thirty thousand children in Chicago for whom full and fair provision is not made. (p. 173)	...less than a fourth of the truly mentally handicapped children in Chicago are being cared for in special classes. (p. 81)	In May, 1964, there was a backlog of 14,000 referrals for psychological examination. (p. 197)
It is manifestly wrong that children failing to carry one study should be retarded to the extent of a full year in their promotion to the next. (p. 88-89)	The examiners of the bureau of child study have often worked on the basis of a too narrow view of the educative process and of the kind and variety of information which is essential to adequate educational guidance. (p. 83)	Today's theory of counseling and placement too often clings to the antiquated concept that the school trains either brain or brawn - not both - and therefore students with below-average academic ability should be placed either in vocational high schools or in the industrial course in general high schools. (p. 252)

Harper	Strayer	Havighurst
Exactly the same studies in exactly the same proportion and by exactly similar methods should not be taught in all parts of the city. (p. 54)	...an adequate curriculum cannot be narrowly conceived as a restricted body of measurable knowledge and skills which pupils shall be expected to acquire. (p. 72)	The consultants remarked that (among the high schools) there was a striking uniformity of curriculum (which) is proving unsuccessful with appreciable numbers of students... (p. 207)
No course of study ... should be so fixed and inflexible as not to allow ... such modification as will adapt it to a particular district or section. (p. 54)	...school authorities ... should strive to adapt the curriculum to the abilities and needs of pupils... (p. 75)	Our consultants felt that the curriculum should be adapted to the needs of different types of students... (p. 215)
(Teachers' faculties should be established) ...to facilitate the discussion in each school of the questions of instruction and discipline ... recognize the principle of local autonomy in school management ... (and) offer the teachers an opportunity to make their experience profitable to the whole system. (p. 167)	A curriculum improvement program can be efficiently consummated only by the joint participation of every teacher and supervisor of the Chicago school staff. (p. 90)	The key to effective teaching in a complex and changing school system is the continual involvement of the teachers in some kind of in-service training... (p. 233)
Too great care cannot be taken in appointing, promoting, and, when necessary, reducing or removing principals. (p. 53)	...no individual (should) be appointed to the principalship ...who is not equipped to lead his teachers to a higher professional plane. (p. 90)	The difference between a successful school and an unsuccessful school ...lies to a very high degree in the kind of leadership exercised by the principal... (p. 67)